

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 13 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in original claim 2. Support for the amendment to claim 2 can be found in the specification, for example, on page, lines 13-15. Claims 9, 11 and 13 are amended for form. Thus, no new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,826 to Hashimoto et al. (hereinafter Hashimoto); and rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hashimoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hashimoto fails to disclose or suggest at least an image forming device that includes a selecting unit enabling a user to select one mode from among the reset signal valid mode and the reset signal invalid mode, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that the laser printer main unit 1, the external unit 31, and the CPRDY signal, all of Hashimoto, correspond to the claimed image forming unit, external device and reset signal, respectively. In addition, the Office Action, in rejecting original claim 2, acknowledges that Hashimoto fails to explicitly disclose a selecting unit, as now recited in amended independent claim 1. However, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hashimoto to include a selecting unit, as recited in independent claim 1. In particular, the Office Action alleges that because Hashimoto discloses a test print switch (discussed in the *fifth embodiment* section of Hashimoto, but not shown in the drawings of Hashimoto), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a selection as to whether or not a reset is to occur. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

Applicant submits that the CPRDY signal of Hashimoto (the alleged reset signal) is a signal that is transmitted from a video controller 27 to a video controller 26, both of which are

included in the laser printer main unit 1 (the alleged image forming unit) (see Hashimoto, col. 4, lines 22-24). Therefore, the CPRDY signal of Hashimoto is not a signal that is transmitted from the external unit 31 (the alleged external device). Furthermore, Hashimoto fails to disclose or suggest any signal that is transmitted from the external unit 31 of Hashimoto that can reasonably be considered to correspond to the claimed reset signal.

Applicant also submits that Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest that the *fifth embodiment* section of Hashimoto includes the capability of ignoring a wake-up designation command. Further, the test print switch of Hashimoto merely shifts a laser printer main unit 1 from stand-by mode to print mode for effecting a test print, and thus the depression of the test print switch effectively awakens the laser printer main unit 1. Moreover, if a user depresses the test print switch of Hashimoto, he/she is not capable of selecting a mode/state in which a reset signal is considered valid or invalid, as recited in independent claim 1. In contrast, the claimed selecting unit enables a user to select one mode from among the reset signal valid mode and the reset signal invalid mode.

Additionally, Applicant submits that if test print switch of Hashimoto is depressed by a user, and no operation is determined by the system as to have been taken during a predetermined period of time, the system returns to a sleep mode. Thus, a user operating the test print switch of Hashimoto does not have the capability of selecting one mode from among the reset signal valid mode and the reset signal invalid mode.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over Hashimoto. Further, the rejection of claim 2 is premised upon the presumption that Hashimoto discloses all of the features of independent claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. As discussed above, Hashimoto does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 1. Thus, claim 2 is patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claim 1, as well

as for the additional features this claim recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over Hashimoto, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,975 to Kataoka et al. (hereinafter Kataoka). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that Hashimoto discloses all of the features of independent claim 1, from which claims 3-13 depend. As discussed above, Hashimoto does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 1. Thus, claims 3-13 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Further, Kataoka does not remedy the deficiencies of Hashimoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.  
Registration No. 61,310

JAO:LXF/mld

Date: April 28, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--